

REMARKS

Claims 49-85 are presently pending in this application. The Examiner rejected claims 49-85. Claims 1-48 were previously cancelled. By this Response, claims 50, 62, and 71 are canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. Claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85 are amended. The amendment to the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 49-85 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426, (Lakritz) in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0028889 (McCoskey). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

The amended claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85 recite “accessing remote content in a first language through the Internet by crawling a web site”. This is different from Lakritz that accesses content for translation from a centrally managed database. The Examiner contended that McCoskey teaches crawling a web site. The Applicants respectfully point out that McCoskey does not teach additional features recited in the amended claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85. Specifically, these amended claims recite “determining whether there exists at least one of the translatable components that does not have a corresponding translated component”. That is, it is determined which portion(s) of the accessed remote content has not been translated. In addition, these amended claims recite “generating statistics based only on the at least one translatable component that does not have a corresponding translated component in order to size the content for language translation”. That is, the statistics generated apply only to

the portion(s) that have not been translated previously and such statistics are generated for sizing the amount of content that needs to be translated.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Lakritz and McCoskey, either alone or in combination, do not teach the above discussed features. It is well recognized that in order for prior art references to render claims obvious, each and every claim limitation has to be taught in the prior art references. Since Lakritz and McCoskey do not teach or disclose the features discussed above, they can not render claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85 obviousness. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 51-59, 63-69, 72-73, and 75-82 depend from claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85, respectively, they are not obvious for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claims 49, 60, 61, 70, 74, 83, 84, and 85 and for the additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 51-59, 63-69, 72-73, and 75-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Bernard P. Goll (Reg. No. 46,429)
for
Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/QH:llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 3, 2008

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**